

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| PETER POE, <i>et al.</i> , |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. 4:23-cv-00177-JFH-SH |
| |) | |
| GENTNER DRUMMOND, <i>et al.</i> , |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

**Motion of Arkansas, Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas,
Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina,
South Dakota, Utah, and West Virginia For Leave to File Brief as *Amici Curiae* in Support
of Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction**

Proposed amici curiae are the States of Arkansas, Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, and West Virginia. Proposed amici respectfully move for leave to file the attached amicus brief in support of Defendant's Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Amici States offer unique and important perspectives on the implication of Plaintiffs' arguments and request for relief, and believe their briefing will benefit the Court.

District courts have broad discretion to allow participation of amici curiae. While this Court does not have specific rules for the filing of amicus briefs, it has "inherent authority" to allow them. *United States v. Louisiana*, 751 F. Supp. 608, 620 (E.D. La. 1990) (citing *United States v. Michigan*, 116 F.R.D. 655, 660 (W.D. Mich. 1987)). "Courts typically grant amicus status where the parties 'contribute to the court's understanding of the matter in question' by proffering timely and useful information." *Ga. Aquarium, Inc. v. Pritzker*, 135 F. Supp. 3d 1280, 1288 (N.D. Ga. 2015) (citation omitted). When exercising their discretion, courts "err on the side of granting leave" because "[i]f an amicus brief that turns out to be unhelpful is filed, the [court], after studying the

case, will often be able to make that determination without much trouble and can then simply disregard the amicus brief. On the other hand, if a good brief is rejected, the [court] will be deprived of a resource that might have been of assistance.” *Neonatology Assocs., P.A. v. Comm'r*, 293 F.3d 128, 133 (3d Cir. 2002) (Alito, J.).

Like Oklahoma, proposed amici are concerned by the recent surge of children suffering from gender dysphoria and other forms of gender-related psychological distress. And like Oklahoma, proposed amici are concerned because these vulnerable children are suffering greatly and need help. The question is how to help them. Throughout their brief, Plaintiffs assert that gender-transition procedures—puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and surgical interventions—are “the only effective treatment for gender dysphoria.” Doc. 6 at 7. The problem is that the evidence does not support this approach—regardless of whatever label Plaintiffs wish to attach. That’s why experts in several European countries and the State of Florida have moved away from those treatments. And that’s why a growing number of States, including some of the proposed amici, have banned gender-transition procedures when provided to minors. Proposed amici thus write in support of Oklahoma’s similar law and respectfully ask the Court to grant their motion for leave to file the attached brief.

Respectfully submitted on this 16th day of June, 2023,

Steve Marshall
Attorney General
Edmund G. LaCour Jr.*
Solicitor General
A. Barrett Bowdre*
Principal Deputy Solicitor General

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF ALABAMA
501 Washington Avenue
P.O. Box 300152
Montgomery, AL 36130-0152
(334) 242-7300
Edmund.LaCour@AlabamaAG.gov

Tim Griffin
Attorney General
Nicholas J. Bronni*
Solicitor General
s/ Dylan L. Jacobs
Dylan L. Jacobs
Deputy Solicitor General
Michael A. Cantrell*
Assistant Solicitor General

OFFICE OF THE ARKANSAS ATTORNEY
GENERAL
323 Center Street, Suite 200
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 682-6302
Dylan.Jacobs@ArkansasAG.gov

Counsel for Amici Curiae

* *pro hac vice* motion forthcoming

(Additional Amici Counsel listed below)

ADDITIONAL COUNSEL

TREG TAYLOR
Attorney General
State of Alaska

ANDREW BAILEY
Attorney General
State of Missouri

ASHLEY MOODY
Attorney General
State of Florida

AUSTIN KNUDSEN
Attorney General
State of Montana

CHRIS CARR
Attorney General
State of Georgia

MICHAEL T. HILGERS
Attorney General
State of Nebraska

RAÚL R. LABRADOR
Attorney General
State of Idaho

DREW H. WRIGLEY
Attorney General
State of North Dakota

THEODORE E. ROKITA
Attorney General
State of Indiana

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General
State of South Carolina

BRENNNA BIRD
Attorney General
State of Iowa

MARTY JACKLEY
Attorney General
State of South Dakota

KRIS W. KOBACH
Attorney General
State of Kansas

SEAN REYES
Attorney General
State of Utah

DANIEL CAMERON
Attorney General
Commonwealth of Kentucky

PATRICK MORRISEY
Attorney General
State of West Virginia

LYNN FITCH
Attorney General
State of Mississippi

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing motion was served on all parties via this Court's CM/ECF system.

Dated: June 16, 2023

s/ Dylan L. Jacobs
Dylan L. Jacobs